



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,885	05/31/2005	Ebrahim Firoozabady	63-000600US	6613
22798 7590 06/29/2010 QUINE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C. P O BOX 458 ALAMEDA, CA 94501				
EXAMINER				
KALLIS, RUSSELL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1638				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/29/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/536,885

Applicant(s)

FIROOZABADY, EBRAHIM

Examiner

RUSSELL KALLIS

Art Unit

1638

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 2/25/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 10, 18 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 5, 10, 18 and 21-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Previous rejections under 102 and 103(a) with respect to Mazzetti are withdrawn in light of the art filed in IDS filed 3/15/2010.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, and 21-23 are pending and examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sripaoraya S. *et al.* Annals of Botany (October 2001) 88: pp. 597-603. in view of U.S. Patent 5,952,543 issued 19 September 1999.

The claims are broadly drawn to a method of generating a plant comprising transformed plant cells comprising culturing non-apical meristematic cells to produce shoots and then culturing leaf explants from those shoots to produce organogenic cells that give rise to a transformed plant.

Sripaoraya teaches a method of generating a pineapple plant comprising transformed pineapple plant cells by culturing non-apical meristematic cells to produce shoots and then culturing leaf base explants from those shoots and transforming the base leaf explant cells using a biolistic method to produce organogenic cells that give rise to a transformed plant (see Abstract page 597, Methods section 1st paragraph page 597 in column 2, Results section column 2 1st paragraph page 599, and the entire Discussion section on page 602).

Sripaoraya does not teach *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation.

Firoozabady teaches *Agrobacterium* mediated transformation of pineapple (see columns 11-25 and the claims).

It would have been obvious at the time of filing to substitute the transformation of Pineapple using the *Agrobacterium* methodology taught by Firoozabady for that of Sripaoraya. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated by the success of Firoozabady in transforming Pineapple using *Agrobacterium* and had a reasonable expectation of success given the success of Firoozabady and Sripaoraya in transforming Pineapple; wherein transforming pineapple with a polynucleotide that encodes a polypeptide that is homologous or heterologous to an endogenous polypeptide of the transformed plant is an obvious matter of choice.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1, 5, 10, 18 and 21-23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of U.S. Patent No. 7,663,021 issued 2/15/2010. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method of controlling carotenoid accumulation by transforming a pineapple cell with a carotenoid biosynthetic polypeptide regulator is coextensive in scope with the instantly claimed method of generating a transformed plant comprising transforming a plant with at least one polynucleotide encoding a carotenoid biosynthetic polypeptide.

Claims 1, 5, 10, 18, and 21-23 are rejected.

Claim 23 is deemed free of the prior art given the failure of the prior art to teach or reasonably suggest a method of transforming a plant with carotenoid biosynthetic genes using base leaf explants cultured from cultured shoots and Agrobacterium.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RUSSELL KALLIS whose telephone number is (571)272-0798. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Russell Kallis/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1638
June 14, 2010